



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,129	12/11/2001	Vij Rajarajan	MS167419.2/40062.151USU1	1970

27488 7590 11/28/2003

MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,129

Applicant(s)

RAJARAJAN ET AL.

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to application filed on December 11, 2001 in which claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

1. *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement filed on 03/20/02 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Because it has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

2. *Specification*

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on pages 1 and 2 of patent application, all the cross reference related applications need to enter completely include the serial number, titled, ...

Appropriate correction is required.

3. *Claim Objections*

Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities: the system as defined in claim 19, there is not claim 19 in the application. Appropriate correction is required.

4. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for

Art Unit: 2171

patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Call (U.S 6154738).

Regarding claim 12, Call discloses: In a network environment having multiple resources, a computer program product readable by a computer and encoding instructions for executing a method, the method comprising:

receiving a notification that a new resource has been installed on the network environment (col. 6, lines 16-40, Call), the installation process including communication information with the new resource (col. 6, lines 16-40, Call);

retrieving search information associated with new resource (col. 8, lines 40-49, Call);

storing the search information associated with the new resource (col. 8, lines 30-38, Call);

and

sharing the search information with another resource on the network (col. 13, lines 55 to col. 14, lines 2, Call).

Regarding claim 13, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12. In addition, Call discloses: wherein the notification includes the search information (col. 8, lines 40-49, Call).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 15, Call discloses: A system for query-based management of a plurality of resources comprising:

- a management module (420, fig. 6 and corresponding text, Call) in communication with the plurality of resources, the management module capable of receiving a request to access information related to one or more of the plurality of resources (col. 28, lines 44-57, Call) and to receive search information from the plurality of resources, the request relating to a query (col. 28, lines 58 to col. 29, lines 12, Call); and

in response to the receipt of a query request, the management module performing search functions on more than one resource to display accessed information (col. 28, lines 44-57, Call).

Regarding claim 17, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 15. In addition, Call discloses: wherein each of the plurality of resources provides information to the search manager in XML format (col. 28, lines 44-57, Call).

Regarding claim 18, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 17. In addition, Call discloses: wherein one of the resources has a dedicated search engine for performing searches (col. 32, lines 65 to col. 33, lines 11, Call).

6. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject

Art Unit: 2171

matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call (U.S. 6154738) in view of Thackston (U.S. 6295513).

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Call discloses: a method and a computer program product readable for managing resources in a distributed network, comprising:

receiving a query from a client computer system in the distributed network (col. 28, lines 58 to col. 29, lines 11, Call);

accessing a plurality of resources in response to the query (col. 28, lines 58 to col. 29, lines 11, Call).

However, Call didn't disclose: providing management task options related to the query from more than one resource. On the other hand, Thackston discloses: providing management task options related to the query from more than one resource (col. 44, lines 44-55, lines 33, Thackston). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include task options related to the query in the system of Call as taught by Thackston. The motivation being to enable the user selects search options between a limited search or full search (col. 44, lines 44-55, lines 33, Thackston).

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Call/Thackston discloses: wherein the method further comprises:

receiving a request to display an instance of a managed object (col. 28, lines 44-57, Call);

displaying attribute information related to the managed object (col. 30, lines 10-30, Call);

and

Art Unit: 2171

displaying task information received from at least two back-end resources in response to the request to display the object information (col. 9 lines 49-67, Call).

Regarding claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 2. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

8. Claims 3-7, 10, 11, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call (U.S 6154738) in view of Thackston (U.S 6295513) and further in view of Li et al. (U.S 5911138) (Li).

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Call/Thackston discloses: wherein the method further comprises: receiving search information from a first one of the plurality of resources related a managed object type (col. 18, lines 12-22, Call);

receiving search handler information related to object type, the search handler relating to search functions on the resource (col. 8, lines 40-49, Call);

However, Call/Thackston didn't disclose: storing the search information in a search store and in response to the request to display information, determining whether the information is in the search store, and if not retrieving the information from the resource using the search handler; and displaying the information. On the other hand, Li disclose: storing the search information in a search store (col. 7, lines 5-25, Li) and in response to the request to display information, determining whether the information is in the search store, and if not retrieving the information from the resource using the search handler; and displaying the information (col. 7, lines 39 to col. 8, lines 15, Li). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

Art Unit: 2171

person of ordinary skill in the art to include steps for storing the search information and display information, determining information in the combination system of Call/Thackston as taught by Li. The motivation being enable to store the query objects and display the request in the history window, the search history is retrieved from storage and determines the type of input the user made to process that produced the desired results (col. 7, lines 5-65, Li).

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 3. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Regarding claim 4, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 3. In addition, Call/Thackston/Li discloses: wherein the search handler relates to a search engine on the resource (col. 9, lines 27-35, Call).

Regarding claim 5, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 3. In addition, Call/Thackston/Li discloses: wherein the search handler relates to search engines on more than one resource (col. 9, lines 50-67, Call).

Regarding claim 6, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 3. In addition, Call/Thackston/Li discloses: wherein the method further comprises: in response to the request to display object information, retrieving information stored in the search store (col. 7, lines 5-22, Li); and displaying additional information from the search store to allow the user to refine the query (col. 7, lines 23-38, Li).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 7, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Call/Thackston/Li discloses: wherein the method further comprising: associating a first search component with a first object type, wherein the first search component relates to object attributes managed by a first resource (col. 8, lines 23-48, Li); and associating a second search component with the first object type, wherein the second search component relates to object attributes managed by a second resource (col. 8, lines 23-48, Li).

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 7. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Regarding claim 14, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12. In addition, Call/Li discloses: wherein the search information relates to an object type managed by the new resource, the method further comprising:

determining whether the search information relates to an existing managed object type (col. 7, lines 39 to col. 8, lines 15, Li);

if so, associating the search information with the existing object type (col. 7, lines 39 to col. 8, lines 15, Li); and

if not, associating the search information with a new object type (col. 7, lines 39 to col. 8, lines 15, Li).

Regarding claim 16, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 15. In addition, Call/Li discloses: wherein the management module comprises a search manager to receive and store search information (col. 33, lines 1-12, Call), the search manager

Art Unit: 2171

further communicates with the resources to perform the requested searches (col. 7, lines 5-25, Li).

9. Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gish (U.S 6052711) Object-oriented system, method and article of manufacture for a client server session web access in an interprise computing framework system.

Meltzer et al. (U.S 6125391). Market makers using documents for commerce in trading partner networks.

10. Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CN

Cindy Nguyen
November 21, 2003

Wayne
WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER